



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,135	03/08/2005	Joanna Ng	CA920020068US1	9468
70854 7590 03/03/2011 WILSON HAM & HOLMAN/RSW 1361 N Hwy 89, Suite 9 Suite 9 Farmington, UT 84025				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, VAN KIM T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2456				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/03/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JEFF@TECHPATENTS.COM
LAUREN@TECHPATENTS.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/527,135

Applicant(s)

NG ET AL.

Examiner

Van Kim T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2456

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 19-31 and 34-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 19-31 and 34-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communications filed on November 23, 2010. Claims 1-4, 19-31 and 34-36 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of the appeal brief filed on November 23, 2010, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Rupal D. Dharia/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-4, 19-31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-4, 19-31 and 34-36 are not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 16, lines 4-10, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as intangible embodiments (e.g., modulated carrier signal, the signal may be a transmission over a network). As such, the claims are not limited to statutory subject matter and therefore non-statutory.

To overcome this type of 101 rejections the claims need to be amended to include only the physical computer media and not a transmission media or other intangible or non-functional media. In the interest of expediting the examination process, the claims rejected under 35 USC 101 (nonstatutory) above further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-4 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Griffin (US 7,367,014).

Regarding claim 1, Griffin discloses an apparatus comprising:

a portal server (302, Fig. 3) for operating a web portal to provide access to the web application (col. 3: line 58 – col. 4: line 37);

a computer readable storage medium comprising computer program code recorded thereon to implement a portlet application for operating on the portal server, for managing a collection of associated portlets (col. 2: lines 60-67);

the portlet application (web browser) configured to:

initiate portlets on requests of a user to access the web application (col. 3: lines 53-62);

manage a portlet application session object (portal page; col. 2: lines 42-60) for the portlets, wherein the portlet application session object comprises a data store object (portal skins, portal templates, portlets) shared by a plurality of the portlets in the portlet application (col. 4: line 51 – col. 5: line 25); and,

the portlet application (web browser) comprising:

a portlet application session object data store (portal skins, portal templates, and portlets) controlled by the portlet application session object (portal page) for saving parameters from user requests for associating the portlets with the portlet application session object (skins and templates can be customized; col. 5: lines 2-23).

Regarding claim 2, Griffin also discloses the portlet application (web browser) further comprises a portlet application communication client (client 300) for communicating between the portlet application session object and the web application to convey user requests received from the associated portlets to the web application (col. 3: lines 1-9, and 53-62).

Regarding claim 3, Griffin also discloses the portlet application is configured to assign a common key (template placeholder) to each portlet associated with the portlet application session object (portal manager 306 binds portlets to template placeholder to determine capabilities or permission; col. 5: lines 24-58).

Regarding claim 4, Griffin also discloses a user session information table configured to connect to multiple web applications with the portlet application session object (col. 3: lines 23-41).

Regarding claim 19, Griffin also discloses a method for use with multiple associated portlets in a web portal, comprising:

managing the multiple associated portlets using a portlet application session object (portal page tabs 100-104; col. 2: lines 42-60), wherein the portlet application session object comprises a data store object (portal skins, portal templates, portlets) shared by a plurality of the portlets in the portlet application (col. 4: line 51 – col. 5: line 25);

implementing a portlet application data store according to computer program code recorded on a computer readable storage medium (col. 4: line 51 – col. 5: line 58); and

granting read/write access to the portlet application data store by the multiple associated portlets to enable the multiple associated portlets to exchange data among each other (the template area occupied by the placeholder could be shared among the portlets; col. 3: lines 25-41).

Regarding claim 20, Griffin also discloses managing the multiple associated portlets is implemented by a portlet application (col. 2: lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 21, Griffin also discloses managing the portlet application session object, wherein the portlet application session object is configured to manage the portlet application data store (col. 4: line 51 – col. 5: line 25).

Regarding claim 22, Griffin also discloses granting read/write access to the portlet application data store is implemented by the portlet application session object (the template area occupied by the placeholder could be shared among the portlets; col. 3: lines 25-41).

Regarding claim 23, Griffin also discloses operating a portlet server on a portal server (302; Fig. 3) for hosting the multiple associated portlets in the web portal accessible to a user (col. 3: line 58 – col. 4: line 37).

Regarding claim 24, Griffin also discloses creating the portlet application session object for the user (skins and template of the portal page can be customized; col. 5: lines 2-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin, as applied to claims 1 and 19, respectively above, in view of Heymann et al (US 2004/-193699).

Regarding claim 34, Griffin does not disclose the portlet application session object provides an infrastructure for a plurality of the portlets in the portlet application to have independent user sessions, to share the same portlet application session, and to communicate with the web application via a single web application session.

Heymann teaches discloses the portlet application session object provides an infrastructure for a plurality of the portlets in the portlet application to have independent user sessions, to share the same portlet application session, and to communicate with the web application via a single web application session (§§[0032-0040]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Heymann's session return enabling stateful web applications in Griffin's system in order to enable navigating between web sessions in a coherent or stateful manner.

9. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin, as applied to claim 19 above, in view of Cook et al (US 2003/0117437).

Regarding claim 25, Griffin also discloses further comprising: creating and managing a key for the user for the portlet application session object; and granting the key to each associated portlet for controlling access to the portlet application session object.

Cook teaches:

creating and managing a key for the user for the portlet application session object (assigning a portal user to a role-based administrator group; ¶¶[0019]); and
granting the key to each associated portlet for controlling access to the portlet application session object (¶¶[0047-0049]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Cook's portal administration tool in Griffin's system in order to provide an interactive tool for managing portals.

Regarding claim 26, Griffin-Cook also discloses operating a portlet application on a portal server for hosting the multiple associated portlets in a web portal accessible by the user (col. 2: lines 60-67, and col. 3: line 53 – col. 4: line 37).

Regarding claim 27, Griffin-Cook also discloses one portlet application is assigned to each user, and one key is assigned respectively for each user to respective portlet application session objects for each portlet application (each user is associated with a property set; ¶¶[0025-0026], Cook).

10. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin, in view of Musson et al (US 7,752,677).

Regarding claim 28, Griffin discloses an apparatus for displaying to a user a web portal for a web application, the apparatus comprising:

a portal server (302; Fig. 3) for operating the web portal to provide access to the web application by the user (col. 3: line 58 – col. 4: line 37);

a computer readable storage medium comprising computer program code recorded thereon to implement a portlet application, for managing a managing a collection of associated portlets, for operating on the portal server (col. 2: lines 60-67);

a portlet application session object for the user for the associated portlets (col. 3: lines 53-62);

a portlet application session object data store controlled by the portlet application session object (col. 4: line 51 – col. 5: line 25); and

a portlet application communication client linked to the portlet application session object data store for communicating between the associated portlets and the web application to convey user requests received from the associated portlets to the web application (col. 3: lines 1-9 and 53-62).

Griffin does not explicitly disclose a request buffer for storing requests from the associated portlets to enable the portlet application communication client to generate requests relative to the web application.

Musson teaches a request buffer for storing requests from the associated portlets to enable the portlet application communication client to generate requests relative to the web application (col. 15: line 54 – col. 16: line 21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Musson's usage of buffer request in Griffin's system since it is completely transparent to the rendering control and no special coding or handling is required.

11. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin-Musson, in view of Bales et al (US 7,725,560).

Regarding claim 29, Griffin-Musson does not explicitly disclose portlet application communication client is further configured to generate the requests synchronized to the web application, to send information including the requests over a network to the web application, and to receive information including responses to the requests from the web application.

Bales teaches portlet application communication client is further configured to generate the requests synchronized to the web application, to send information including the requests over a network to the web application, and to receive information including responses to the requests from the web application (col. 3: lines 10-11, and col. 4: lines 29-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Bales's teaching in Griffin-Musson's system in order to facilitate the usage of portlets and web service displays.

Regarding claim 30, Griffin-Musson does not explicitly disclose portlet application communication client is further configured to generate the requests serialized to the web application; to send information including the requests over a network to the web application, and to receive information including responses to the requests from the web application.

Bales also discloses portlet application communication client is further configured to generate the requests serialized to the web application; to send information including the requests over a network to the web application, and to receive information including responses to the requests from the web application (col. 6: lines 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Bales's teaching in Griffin-Musson's system in order to facilitate the usage of portlets and web service displays.

Claim 31 is rejected under the same basis.

12. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin-Musson, as applied to claim 28 above, in view of Heymann et al (US 2004/-193699).

Regarding claim 34, Griffin-Musson does not disclose the portlet application session object provides an infrastructure for a plurality of the portlets in the portlet application to have independent user sessions, to share the same portlet application session, and to communicate with the web application via a single web application session.

Heymann teaches discloses the portlet application session object provides an infrastructure for a plurality of the portlets in the portlet application to have independent user sessions, to share the same portlet application session, and to communicate with the web application via a single web application session (§§(0032-0040)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Heymann's session return enabling stateful web applications in Griffin-Musson's system in order to enable navigating between web sessions in a coherent or stateful manner.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rupal D. Dharia/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456

Van Kim T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2152

vkkn